

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/047,684  
Attorney Docket No. WMA-99-011D1

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-15, 17, 18, 21, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over TESSLER et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,090) in view of TOY et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,115), and rejected claims 6, 9, 10, 16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over TESSLER et al. in view of TOY et al., and further in view of BARAL et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,932,042).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claims 1-21 and 55 remain pending.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11-15, 17, 18, 21, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over TESSLER et al. in view of TOY et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

TESSLER et al. is directed to a system that delivers display information to a calling party (Abstract).

TOY et al. is directed to a system that provides a calling party with information about a called party (Abstract). TOY et al. discloses that the information may include the called party's name and/or location (col. 2, lines 16-23).

By contrast, claim 1 recites receiving a request from a calling party to send to a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, where the request is initiated in response to the calling party selecting one or more designated keys during an establishment of a call between the first call station and the second call station, and sending the number in accordance with the request.

Applicants respectfully submit that TESSLER et al. and TOY et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/047,684  
Attorney Docket No. WMA-99-011D1

For example, TESSLER et al. and TOY et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving a request from a calling party to send to a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, where the request is initiated in response to the calling party selecting one or more designated keys during an establishment of a call between the first call station and the second call station. With respect to this feature, the Examiner admitted that TESSLER et al. does not disclose this feature and relied on col. 4, lines 1-16 and 55-67, of TOY et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1 (Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants submit that TOY et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Col. 4, lines 1-16, of TOY et al. discloses:

FIG. 2 is a flow diagram, illustrating the operation of Applicant's invention. A caller dials a called number, (Action Block 201). Test 203 is used to determine whether the caller has requested called number information. The service provider may elect to provide this feature to all callers served by the service provider. The test can be based on a class of service of the caller, whereby: the caller always requests this information; a prefix dialed by the caller as an indication of a request for the called number information; a switchable toggle for the service, under the control of the caller; the information is to be requested for all calls to a specified group of telephone numbers, or for all calls except those to a specified group; or some more specialized class of service requesting called number information for selected, or all but selected, types of calls, for example, for all calls except those made using speed calling.

This section of TOY et al. discloses techniques by which a caller can request called number information. TOY et al. specifically discloses that the called number information can include the called party's name and/or location (col. 2, lines 16-23). TOY et al. does not disclose or suggest that the called number information includes the telephone number of the called party, as required by Applicants' claim 1.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/047,684  
Attorney Docket No. WMA-99-011D1

Col. 4, lines 55-67, of TOY et al. discloses:

In Action Block 213, the caller can request extended information by dialing a special prefix; if the caller has requested the extended information, then a dialogue is established with the database that contains the extended information for the called customer. The most simple type of dialogue is one in which prompting announcements are provided to the caller, and the caller responds by keying a Dual-tone Multi-frequency (DTMF) response, or by saying a word, or words that are then recognized using speech recognition. The originating switch converts between messages to the database and announcements to the caller, and between DTMF or voice signals from the caller and messages to the database.

This section of TOY et al. discloses techniques by which a caller can request extended information. TOY et al. defines "extended information" as "information ... beyond the basic location information provided to the caller" (col. 4, lines 47-50). TOY et al. does not disclose or suggest that the extended information includes the telephone number of the called party, as required by Applicants' claim 1. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants request that the Examiner specifically point out where TOY et al. discloses receiving a request from a calling party to send to a first call station a number sent from the first call station and associated with a second call station, where the request is initiated in response to the calling party selecting one or more designated keys during an establishment of a call between the first call station and the second call station, as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over TESSLER et al. and TOY et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/047,684  
Attorney Docket No. WMA-99-011D1

Claims 2-5, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over TESSLER et al. and TOY et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claims 11, 21, and 55 recite features similar to those given above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over TESSLER et al. and TOY et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 12-15, 17, and 18 depend from claim 11. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over TESSLER et al. and TOY et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 11.

Claims 6, 9, 10, 16, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over TESSLER et al. in view of TOY et al., and further in view of BARAL et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

BARAL et al. is directed to a voice and data messaging system. In BARAL et al., when a calling party receives a busy signal, the calling party may dial "\*867" to be connected to a Voice Message Operations Center for recording a voice message for the called party (Abstract).

Claims 6, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BARAL et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of TESSLER et al. and TOY et al. noted above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 6, 9, and 10 are patentable over TESSLER et al., TOY et al., and BARAL et al., whether

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/047,684  
Attorney Docket No. WMA-99-011D1

taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 16, 19, and 20 depend from claim 11. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BARAL et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of TESSLER et al. and TOY et al. noted above with respect to claim 11. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 16, 19, and 20 are patentable over TESSLER et al., TOY et al., and BARAL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 11.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/047,684  
Attorney Docket No. WMA-99-011D1

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 13-2491 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By:   
John E. Harrity  
Registration No. 43,367

Date: November 21, 2003

11240 Waples Mill Road  
Suite 300  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800